1	Grupo	Nota	Projeto	Comments
novo grupo 1 17 PA have been exposed better. DS methodology could have be more solid proves of the province of the characteristic province of the independent variation poor conclusions.  3 12 ML Report not well structured. Methodologically not solid word doesn't justify properly the choice of the independent variation poor conclusions.  4 16 ML Solid province of the report quite confusing. EDA well done. Conclusion should have been more elaborated of the conclusion should have been more elaborated.  A 16 ML Structure of the report quite confusing. EDA well done. Complete DS pipeline. Conclusion should have been more elaborated of What is the qowz file format? You chose to show only step that were well succeeded. It'd be helpful to list sources of problems and how they were solved.  C 15 cloud Interest of the conceeding the conceeding of the conceeding the conceeding the conceeding of the conceeding	1	14	ML	Methodology of DS pipeline not solid. Conclusion should have
novo grupo 2  12  ML  Report not well structured. A lot of work but without justifica of the choices. Cannot understand the soundness of the methodological approach. Missing results and conclusions and conclusions are supported to the independent variate poor conclusions.  4  16  ML  Report not well structured. Methodologichally not solid word doesn't justify properly the choice of the independent variate poor conclusions.  4  16  ML  Sodo exploratory analysis. Complete DS pipeline, but falls back in the lack of justification about the features in use. Conclusion should have been more elaborated.  A  16  ML  Structure of the report quite confusing. EDA well done. Complete DS pipeline. Conclusion should have been more elaborated.  B  17  cloud  What is the goov [life format? You chose to show only step that were well succeeded. It'd be helpful to list sources of problems and how they were solved.  C  15  cloud  L  L  L  L  L  L  L  L  L  L  L  L  L	novo grupo 1	17	PA	Work well done. complete analysis, however insights could have been exposed better. DS methodology could have been more solid
novo grupo 2  12  ML  of the choices. Cannot understand the soundness of the methodological appraceh. Missing results and conclusions 3  12  ML  Report not well structured. Methodologichally not solid word doesn't justify properly the choice of the independent variat poor conclusions  Good exploratory analysis. Complete DS pipeline, but falls back in the lack of justification about the features in use.  A  16  ML  Structure of the report quite confusing. EDA well done. Complete DS pipeline. Conclusion should have been more elaborated.  Structure of the report quite confusing. EDA well done. Complete DS pipeline. Conclusion should have been more elaborated.  B  17  cloud  What is the qoove file format? You chose to show only step that were well succeeded. It'd be helpful to list sources of problems and how they were solved.  I believe some of the problems you faced are associated we then use of the GCP to install your own cloud. Have you trie use your own resources?  A  Report not well structured. Good exploratory analysis, how the justification of feature selection is not well explained.  Experiments (los prediction) are not complete. Conclusion should have been more elaborated  Bom trabalho, relatório bem feito e explicativo. Poderiam te discutido as principais dificuldades tecnicas e a for como as resolveram.  ML  ML  Report not well structured. EDA not very inshightfull. Los prediction pipeline not consider any of the frameworks presented in the classes.  Report not well structured. EDA not very inshightfull. Los prediction pipeline not ownider any of the frameworks presented in the classes.  Report not well structured. Ploat per per any of the frameworks presented in the classes.  Report not well structured. Choices not properly justified.  ML  Cloud  Lack of refs. Good work. Explored various libs.  Report not well structured. Benchamark not well explained. pipeline not properly justified. Conclusions and insights not well presented  Methodology is un pouco confusa; em que correspondem as numerical Features	2	16	PA	Work well done. complete analysis, however description of the findings and coclusions could be bettr
12   ML   doesn't justify properly the choice of the independent variat poor conclusions	novo grupo 2	12	ML	Report not well structured. A lot of work but without justification of the choices. Cannot understand the soundness of the methodological approach. Missing results and conclusions
A 16 ML back in the lack of justification about the features in use. Conclusion should have been more elaborated.  A 16 ML Structure of the report quite confusing. EDA well done. Complete DS pipeline. Conclusions should have been more elaborated.  B 17 cloud What is the qoow2 file format? You chose to show only site that were well succeeded. It'd be helpful to list sources of problems and how they were solved.  C 15 cloud the use of the GPC to install your own cloud. Have you tried use your own resources?  Report not well structured. Good exploratory analysis, how the justification of feature selection is not well explained. Experiments (los prediction) are not complete. Conclusion should have been more elaborated of some sesolvers.  B 17 cloud discutido e listado as principais dificuldades técnicas e a fo como as resolveram.  G 14 ML Strabalho, relation been felito e explicativo. Poderiam te discutido e listado as principais dificuldades técnicas e a fo como as resolveram.  metodologia não foi clara (e.g quais são as features usada distribução das mesmas).  Pipeline da DS não sound; falta uma crossvalidação, não fi mostrada a capacidade de generalizização do modelo. Con justifica-se um modelo para cada doença? e praticor.  Report not well structured. EDA not very inshightfull. Los prediction pipeline not well executed, conclusions should be more elaborated. DS pipeline not consider any of the frameworks presented in the classes.  I 1 14 ML Report not well structured. EDA not very inshightfull. Los prediction pipeline not well executed, conclusions should be more elaborated. DS pipeline not consider any of the frameworks presented in the classes.  I 1 18 cloud Lack of refs. Good work. Explored various libs.  N 16 ML Report not well structured. Fola not very inshightfull. Los pipeline not consider and on the pipeline and features selection of pipeline not properly justified. Conclusions and insights not presented  N 18 PA Report not well structured. Henchamark not well explained. Proclusions are not short of pip	3	12	ML	·
A 16 ML Complete DS pipeline. Conclusion should have been more elaborated  B 17 cloud What is the qcow2 file format? You chose to show only step that were well succeeded. It'd be helpful to list sources of problems and how they were solved.  C 15 cloud I believe some of the problems you faced are associated we the use of the GCP to install your own cloud. Have you trie use your own resources?  Report not well structured. Good exploratory analysis, how the justification of feature selection is not well explained. Experiments (los prediction) are not complete. Conclusion should have been more elaborated.  F 17 cloud Som trabalho, relatório bem felito e explicativo. Poderiam te discutude de listado as principals dificuldades técnicas e a for como as resolveram.  metodologia não foi clara (e.g quais são as features usada distribuição das mesmas)  ML Pipeline da DS não sound; falta uma crossvalidação, não finostrada a capacidade de generalização do modelo. Con justifica-se um modelo para cada doença? e pratico?  Report not well structured. EDA not very inshightful. Los prediction pipeline not overly inshightful. Los more elaborated. DS pipeline not conclusions should be more elaborated. DS pipeline not conclusions and insights not properly justified.  ML Report not well structured. Choices not properly justified. Missing conclusions  Report not well structured. Feature selection oin ml pipeline properly justified.  ML Report not well structured. Denochamark not well explained. Papeline not properly justified. Conclusions and insights not presented  Report not well structured. Denochamark not well explained. Papeline not properly justified. Conclusions and insights not properly justified. Papeline not properly pipeline not properporate selection oin ml pipeline presented  Report not well structured. What is sequence_length = 30? Conclusions are not well s	4	16	ML	back in the lack of justification about the features in use. Conclusion should have been more elaborated.
B	A	16	ML	Complete DS pipeline. Conclusion should have been more elaborated
the use of the GCP to install your own cloud. Have you tries use your own resources?  Report not well structured. Good exploratory analysis, how the justification of feature selection is not well explained. Experiments (top sprediction) are not complete. Conclusion should have been more elaborated  Bom trabalho, relatório bem feito e explicativo. Poderíam te discutido e listado as principias dificuldades técnicas e a fo como as resolveram.  metodologia não foi clara (e.g quais são as features usada distribuição das mesmas)  Pipeline da DS não sound; falta uma crossvalidação, não fi mostrada a capacidade de generalgização do modelo. Con justifica-se um modelo para cada doença? é pratico?  Report not well structured. Dan ot very inshightfull. Los prediction pipeline not well executed. conclusions should be more elaborated. DS pipeline not consider any of the more elaborated. DS pipeline not consider any of the frameworks presented in the classes.  I 14 ML Report not well structured. Choices not properly justified. Missing conclusions  Report not well structured. Choices not properly justified. Missing conclusions  N 16 ML Report not well structured. Feature selection oin ml pipeline properly justified. Onclusions and insights not presented  P 12 ML Report not well structured. benchamark not well explained. Papeline not properly justified. Conclusions and insights not presented  Report not well structured und pipeline and features selection of properly justified. Conclusions and insights not presented  Metodologia um pouco confusa; em que correspondem as numerical features?  Os items soministrados tem diferentes unidades de misura toda via são consideradas como features só os valores numericos avg.min.max, porque? Relatorio não bem estruturado  R 14 ML Report not well structured. What is sequence_length = 30? EDA not well executed. Conclusions are too short  R 14 ML Report not well structured. Methodology is not explained, conclusions are missing  M 18 PA Report well done.  Welthodology is not well explained, conc	В	17	cloud	problems and how they were solved.
D	С	15	cloud	-
F cloud discution e listado as principais difficuldades técnicas e a fo como as resolveram.    Metodologia não foi clara (e.g quais são as features usada distribuição das mesmas)	D	12	ML	Experiments (los prediction) are not complete. Conclusion
distribuição das mesmas) Pipeline da DS não sound; falta uma crossvalidação, não fi mostrada a capacidade de generalçização do modelo. Con justifica-se um modelo para cada doença? é pratico?  Report not well structured. EDA not very highfull. Los prediction pipeline not well executed. conclusions should be more elaborated. DS pipeline not consider any of the frameworks presented in the classes.  I 14 ML Report not well structured. Choices not properly justified. Missing conclusions  Lack of refs. Good work. Explored various libs.  N 16 ML Report not well structured. Choices not properly justified. Missing conclusions  PA Report not well structured. Feature selection oin ml pipeline properly justified.  Report not well structured. Feature selection oin ml pipeline properly justified. Conclusions and insights not presented  Report not well structured. ml pipeline and features selection to properly justified. Conclusions and insights not presented  Report not well structured. ml pipeline and features selection to properly justified. Conclusions and insights not well presented  Metodologia um pouco confusa; em que correspondem as numerical features?  Os items soministrados tem diferentes unidades de misura toda via são consideradas como features só os valores numericas avg.min,max, porque? Relatorio não bem estruturado  R 14 ML Report not well structured. What is sequence_length = 30? EDA not well executed. Conclusions are too short  Report not well structured. Methodology is not explained, conclusions are missing  T 18 PA Report not well dexecuted. Conclusions are not sent supported by results  Y 18 ML Report well done.	F	17	cloud	Bom trabalho, relatório bem feito e explicativo. Poderiam ter discutido e listado as principais dificuldades técnicas e a forma como as resolveram.
H 12 ML prediction pipeline not well executed. conclusions should be more elaborated. DS pipeline not consider any of the frameworks presented in the classes.  I 14 ML Report not well structured. Choices not properly justified. Missing conclusions  L 18 cloud Lack of refs. Good work. Explored various libs.  N 16 ML Report not well structured. Feature selection oin ml pipeline properly justified  N 20 13 PA Report not well structured. Feature selection oin ml pipeline properly justified. Conclusions and insights not presented  P 12 ML Report not well structured. Heatures selection oin ml pipeline not properly justified. Conclusions and insights not presented  Report not well structured. ml pipeline and features selection oin properly justified. Conclusions and insights not well presented  Metodologia um pouco confusa; em que correspondem as numerical features?  Os items soministrados tem diferentes unidades de misura toda via são consideradas como features só os valores numericos avg.min,max, porque? Relatorio não bem estruturado  R 14 ML Report not well structured. what is sequence_length = 30?  EDA not well executed. Conclusions are too short  Report not well structured. Methodology is not explained, conclusions are missing  T 18 PA Report not well structured. Methodology is not explained, conclusions are missing  X 12 PA Methodology is not well explained, conclusions are not well supported by results  Y 18 ML Report well done.	G	14	ML	Pipeline da DS não sound; falta uma crossvalidação, não foi mostrada a capacidade de generalcização do modelo. Como
L 18 cloud Lack of refs. Good work. Explored various libs.  N 16 ML Report not well structured. Feature selection oin ml pipeline properly justified  O 13 PA Report not well structured. benchamark not well explained, pipeline not properly justified. Conclusions and insights not presented  Report not well structured. Denchamark not well explained, pipeline not properly justified. Conclusions and insights not presented  Report not well structured. In pipeline and features selection to properly justified. Conclusions and insights not well presented  Metodologia um pouco confusa; em que correspondem as numerical features?  Os items soministrados tem diferentes unidades de misura toda via são consideradas como features só os valores numericos avg.min,max, porque? Relatorio não bem estruturado  R 14 ML Report not well structured. What is sequence_length = 30? EDA not well executed. Conclusions are too short  R 20 ML Report not well structured. Methodology is not explained, conclusions are missing  T 18 PA Report well done.  Methodology is not well explained, conclusions are missing  X 12 PA Methodology is not well explained, conclusions are not well supported by results  M NE Report well done.	Н	12	ML	prediction pipeline not well executed. conclusions should be more elaborated. DS pipeline not consider any of the
N 16 ML Report not well structured. Feature selection oin ml pipeline properly justified  Report not well structured. Denchamark not well explained, pipeline not properly justified. Conclusions and insights not presented  Report not well structured. Implement and features selection of presented with the presented of the present	I	14	ML	
P 12 ML Report not well structured. Denchamark not well explained. pipeline not properly justified. Conclusions and insights not presented  Report not well structured. Implement and features selection to properly justified. Conclusions and insights not well presented  Metodologia um pouco confusa; em que correspondem as numerical features?  Os items soministrados tem diferentes unidades de misura toda via são consideradas como features só os valores numericos avg,min,max, porque? Relatorio não bem estruturado  R 14 ML Report not well structured. What is sequence_length = 30? EDA not well executed. Conclusions are too short  R 2 ML Report not well structured. Methodology is not explained, conclusions are missing  T 18 PA Report well done.  U 13 ML Methodology is not well explained, conclusions are not well supported by results  Y 18 ML Report well done.	L	18	cloud	Lack of refs. Good work. Explored various libs.
P pipeline not properly justified. Conclusions and insights not presented  Report not well structured. ml pipeline and features selectic not properly justified. Conclusions and insights not well presented  Metodologia um pouco confusa; em que correspondem as numerical features?  Os items soministrados tem diferentes unidades de misura toda via são consideradas como features só os valores numericos avg.min,max, porque? Relatorio não bem estruturado  R 14 ML Report not well structured. what is sequence_length = 30?  EDA not well executed. Conclusions are too short  R 2 ML Report not well structured. Methodology is not explained, conclusions are missing  T 18 PA Report well done.  X 12 PA Methodology is not well explained, conclusions are not well supported by results  Y 18 ML Report well done.	N	16	ML	Report not well structured. Feature selection oin ml pipeline not properly justified
P 12 ML not properly justified. Conclusions and insights not well presented  Metodologia um pouco confusa; em que correspondem as numerical features? Os items soministrados tem diferentes unidades de misura toda via são consideradas como features só os valores numericos avg.min,max, porque? Relatorio não bem estruturado  R 14 ML Report not well structured. what is sequence_length = 30? EDA not well executed. Conclusions are too short  S 12 ML Report not well structured. Methodology is not explained, conclusions are missing T 18 PA Report well done.  V 18 ML Report not well explained, conclusions are not well supported by results  W 18 ML Report well done.	0	13	PA	Report not well structured. benchamark not well explained. ml pipeline not properly justified. Conclusions and insights not well presented
Numerical features? Os items soministrados tem diferentes unidades de misura toda via são consideradas como features só os valores numericos avg,min,max, porque? Relatorio não bem estruturado  R 14 ML Report not well structured. what is sequence_length = 30? EDA not well executed. Conclusions are too short  S 12 ML Report not well structured. Methodology is not explained, conclusions are missing  T 18 PA Report well done.  X 12 PA Methodology is not well explained, conclusions are not well supported by results  Y 18 ML Report well done.	Р	12	ML	
S 12 ML Report not well executed. Conclusions are too short S 12 ML Report not well structured. Methodology is not explained, conclusions are missing T 18 PA Report well done. U 13 ML Methodology is not well explained, conclusions are missing X 12 PA Methodology is not well explained, conclusions are not well supported by results Y 18 ML Report well done.	Q	13	ML	numerical_features ? Os items soministrados tem diferentes unidades de misura, toda via são consideradas como features só os valores numericos avg,min,max, porque? Relatorio não bem
S 12 ML Report not well structured. Methodology is not explained, conclusions are missing T 18 PA Report well done. U 13 ML Methodology is not well explained, conclusions are missing X 12 PA Methodology is not well explained, conclusions are not well supported by results Y 18 ML Report well done.	R	14	ML	
T 18 PA Report well done.  U 13 ML Methodology is not well explained, conclusions are missing  X 12 PA Methodology is not well explained, conclusions are not well  supported by results Y 18 ML Report well done.  Report well well done.	S	12	ML	Report not well structured. Methodology is not explained,
X 12 PA Methodology is not well explained, conclusions are not well supported by results Y 18 ML Report well done.	Т	18	PA	
X 12 PA Methodology is not well explained, conclusions are not well supported by results Y 18 ML Report well done.	U		ML	Methodology is not well explained, conclusions are missing
Y 18 ML Report well done.				Methodology is not well explained, conclusions are not well
December 1 and 1 a	Y	18	ML	
W 14 ML Report not well structured. Methodology is not explained, conclusions are missing	w	14	М	Report not well structured. Methodology is not explained,